

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 are amended. No new matter is added. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

The arguments made in Applicant's Rule 116 Amendment filed September 27, 2004 are herein incorporated by reference. The Examiner has contended that Hennig, et al. teaches that it is known to send delivery data to a supplier at col. 6, lines 35-40. However, Applicant again respectfully submits that the supplier of Hennig, et al. is analogous to the retailer of Miller, et al. and not to the freight agency of the present claimed invention.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that, regarding claim 3, "Applicant's argument[s] are not persuasive because they are more specific than the claim language allows for." Further, the Examiner noted that no weight was given to the preamble of claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 has been amended to include language from the preamble of claim 3. Claim 3, in relevant part, now recites "storing packaging material data ... as well as goods data ... on the server computer having storage and connectable to first client computers each operated by a retailer, the second client computer operated by the customer, and the third client computer operated by the freight agency." Further, claim 3 recites "sending offering data, including the goods description information in said goods data and the packaging material information in said packaging material data, to the second client computer operated by the customer" and "transmitting the generated delivery instruction data to the third client computer operated by the freight agency." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments previously filed are not more specific than the claim language allows for. Miller, et al. and Hennig, et al., taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "outputting the generated delivery instruction data to a freight agency," as in claim 2, or "transmitting the generated delivery instruction data to the third client computer operated by the freight agency," as in claim 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3, and those claims depending either directly or indirectly therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

November 29, 2004

By:

David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501